

# NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

## OFFICE OF TITLE I



## 2015-2016 TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PLAN\*

\*This plan is only for Title I schoolwide programs that are not identified as a Priority or Focus Schools.

## SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION - ESEA§1114

DISTRICT INFORMATION	SCHOOL INFORMATION
District: IRVINGTON	School: MOUNT VERNON AVENUE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
Chief School Administrator: DR. NEELY HACKETT	Address: 54 MOUNT VERNON AVENUE
Chief School Administrator's E-mail: <a href="mailto:nhackett@irvington.k12.nj.us">nhackett@irvington.k12.nj.us</a>	Grade Levels: PRE-K THROUGH 5
Title I Contact: EILEEN WALTON	Principal: Dr. Shakirah Harrington
Title I Contact E-mail: <a href="mailto:ewalton@irvington.k12.nj.us">ewalton@irvington.k12.nj.us</a>	Principal's E-mail: <a href="mailto:sharrington@irvington.k12.nj.us">sharrington@irvington.k12.nj.us</a>
Title I Contact Phone Number: 973-399-6800 x1673	Principal's Phone Number: 973-399-6875 X1400

### Principal's Certification

**The following certification must be made by the principal of the school. Please Note:** A signed Principal's Certification must be scanned and included as part of the submission of the Schoolwide Plan.

☐ I certify that I have been included in consultations related to the priority needs of my school and participated in the completion of the Schoolwide Plan. As an active member of the planning committee, I provided input for the school's Comprehensive Needs Assessment and the selection of priority problems. I concur with the information presented herein, including the identification of programs and activities that are funded by Title I, Part A.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dr. Shakirah Harrington  
Principal's Name (Print)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dr. Shakirah Harrington  
Principal's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION - ESEA§1114

### Critical Overview Elements

- The School held \_\_\_\_\_ (number) of stakeholder engagement meetings.
- State/local funds to support the school were \$ \_\_\_\_\_, which comprised \_\_\_\_\_% of the school's budget in 2014-2015.
- State/local funds to support the school will be \$ \_\_\_\_\_, which will comprise \_\_\_\_\_% of the school's budget in 2015-2016.
- Title I funded programs/interventions/strategies/activities in 2015-2016 include the following:

Item	Related to Priority Problem #	Related to Reform Strategy	Budget Line Item (s)	Approximate Cost
Implement Saturday Detention Program	1, 2, 3	Decrease student suspension rate	20-T14-200-100-xx-09 (Stipend)	\$2,072.00
		Increase student achievement	20-T14-200-200-xx-09 (Benefits)	\$158.51
School Store Incentives	3	Improve school climate & culture	20-T14-200-600-xx-09 (Supplies)	\$1,000.00
Implement Mentoring programs for the males and females	1, 2, 3	Increase student achievement	20-T14-200-100-xx-09 (Stipend)	\$4,440.00
		Improve school climate & culture	20-T14-200-200-xx-09 (Benefits)	\$339.66
Plan After School activities such as Math & Technology as well as	1, 2, 3	Increase student achievement	20-T14-200-100-xx-09	\$1,480.00

## SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION - ESEA§1114

Literacy & Technology Nights		Improve school climate & culture	(Stipend) 20-T14-200-200-xx-09 (Benefits)	\$113.22
Implementation of After School Tutorial Program Grades 3-5 and Homework Club	1,2	Increase student achievement	20-T14-100-100-xx-09 (Salaries)	\$23,458.00
			20-T14-200-200-xx-09 (Benefits)	\$1,794.54
			20-T14-100-600-xx-09 (Supplies)	\$4,300.00
Poster Maker	1, 2,3	Increase student achievement  Improve school climate & culture	20-T14-400-732-xx-09	\$4,242.17

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii)*

*ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii): "The comprehensive plan shall be . . . - developed with the involvement of parents and other members of the community to be served and individuals who will carry out such plan, including teachers, principals, and administrators (including administrators of programs described in other parts of this title), and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, and, if the plan relates to a secondary school, students from such school;"*

### Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee

**Select committee members to develop the Schoolwide Plan.**

**Note:** For purposes of continuity, some representatives from this Comprehensive Needs Assessment stakeholder committee should be included in the stakeholder/schoolwide planning committee. Identify the stakeholders who participated in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment and/or development of the plan. Signatures should be kept on file in the school office. Print a copy of this page to obtain signatures. **Please Note:** A scanned copy of the Stakeholder Engagement form, with all appropriate signatures, must be included as part of the submission of the Schoolwide Plan.

***\*Add lines as necessary.***

Name	Stakeholder Group	Participated in Comprehensive Needs Assessment	Participated in Plan Development	Participated in Program Evaluation	Signature
SHAKIRAH MILLER-HARRINGOTN	ADMINISTRATION	X	X	X	SHAKIRAH MILLER-HARRINGOTN
MOHAMED BAALA	ADMINISTATION	X	X	X	MOHAMED BAALA
TERRANCE HENRY	SCHOOL STAFF-TEACHER	X	X	X	TERRANCE HENRY
LAUREN GREENFIELD	SCHOOL STAFF-TEACHER	x	X	X	LAUREN GREENFIELD
JENNIFER WHITE	SCHOOL STAFF-TEACHER	x	X	X	JENNIFER WHITE
SERENA FARRELL	SCHOOL STAFF-TEACHER	X	X	X	SERENA FARRELL
TALESHA JONES	SCHOOL STAFF-TEACHER	X	X	X	TALESHA JONES
IMAN HADDIA	SCHOOL STAFF- ELL TEACHER	X	X	X	IMAN HADDIA
JEHITA KITCHEN	SCHOOL STAFF- GUIDANCE	X	X	X	JEHITA KITCHEN

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii)*

### Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee Meetings

**Purpose:**

The Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee organizes and oversees the Comprehensive Needs Assessment process; leads the development of the schoolwide plan; and conducts or oversees the program's annual evaluation.

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee meetings should be held at least quarterly throughout the school year. List below the dates of the meetings during which the Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee discussed the Comprehensive Needs Assessment, Schoolwide Plan development, and the Program Evaluation. Agenda and minutes of these meetings must be kept on file in the school and, upon request, provided to the NJDOE.

Date	Location	Topic	Agenda on File		Minutes on File	
			Yes	No	Yes	No
10/22/14, 10/29/14, 1/23/15, 2/25/15	Main Office/Community Room	Comprehensive Needs Assessment	X		X	
11/19/15, 11/24/15, 3/13/15, 4/22/15	Main Office/Community Room	Schoolwide Plan Development	X		X	
5/4/15, 5/28/15, 6/1/15, 6/10/15	Main Office/Community Room	Program Evaluation	X		X	

***\*Add rows as necessary.***

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii)*

### School's Mission

A collective vision that reflects the intents and purposes of schoolwide programs will capture the school's response to some or all of these important questions:

- What is our intended purpose?
- What are our expectations for students?
- What are the responsibilities of the adults who work in the school?
- How important are collaborations and partnerships?
- How are we committed to continuous improvement?

**What is the school's mission statement?**

The administration, faculty, staff, and parents of Mount Vernon Avenue Elementary School will provide an academically challenging, safe, clean, drug free environment for all stakeholders.

As a community of learners, academic excellence for all students will be expected. A multi-diversified, differentiated academic program which will include rigor, higher- order thinking skills, technology, and a highly qualified faculty will provide students with the necessary skills and strategies to be successful. Students will develop a sense of belonging, self-esteem, and pride in themselves, their school and in their community. They will also develop emotionally, socially, physically, as well as academically. These young people will learn to respect diversity, develop a sense of tolerance and an appreciation for all people, and cultures

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

*24 CFR § 200.26(c): Core Elements of a Schoolwide Program (Evaluation). A school operating a schoolwide program must—(1) Annually evaluate the implementation of, and results achieved by, the schoolwide program, using data from the State's annual assessments and other indicators of academic achievement; (2) Determine whether the schoolwide program has been effective in increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students who had been furthest from achieving the standards; and (3) Revise the plan, as necessary, based on the results of the evaluation, to ensure continuous improvement of students in the schoolwide program.*

### Evaluation of 2014-2015 Schoolwide Program \*

(For schools approved to operate a schoolwide program in 2014-2015, or earlier)

**1. Did the school implement the program as planned? What specific activities were implemented?**

Yes, the school was successful at implementing many of the activities/programs as expected. The school held after school tutoring, mentoring, homework club, and parent workshops.

**2. What were the strengths of the implementation process? What implementation challenges and barriers did the school encounter?**

The strengths of the implementation process included having a group of stakeholders with a vested interest in the academic achievement of the students at Mount Vernon, implement the programs with fidelity. In addition, the stakeholders analyzed data and made necessary adjustments. The tutorial program benefited students by engaging them in common core practice and assessment to prepare them for the PARCC. There were some barriers such as teacher absences and student absences, which resulted in schedule and classroom changes.

**3. What were the apparent strengths and weaknesses of each step during the program(s) implementation?**

The implementation challenges and barriers that were encountered include: the lack of full participation from the students due to attendance issues, new programs that took precedence over the traditional program (Read 180 and My Math), the need for professional development in several areas (formative assessment, differentiated instruction, technology and student engagement), and time constraints. Student and teacher attendance was a major challenge. Lack of parental involvement added to the barriers of success.

**4. How did the school obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders to implement the programs?**



## **SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)***

The school was able to obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders to implement the programs through the support of parents, students, teachers, administrators and community leaders that all assisted in collaborating to develop programs that were geared towards the success and vision of the school. It was communicated through the weekly common planning period, weekly faculty meetings, PTA meetings, and discussing it during SLC meetings because parents are represented on this committee.

### **5. What were the perceptions of the staff? What tool(s) did the school use to measure the staff's perceptions?**

The staff's perception was that they needed to become more directly involved in the decision making which ultimately affects the entire school. The school used surveys as well as allotted time during staff meetings as means to measure the perception of the staff.

### **6. What were the perceptions of the community? What tool(s) did the school use to measure the community's perceptions?**

Parents were provided an opportunity during PTA and parental workshops throughout the year to share their thoughts on the school-wide program. In addition, the parents felt that more security was needed for the protection of their children and that the overall atmosphere of the school had become more welcoming to parents.

### **7. What were the methods of delivery for each program (i.e. one-on-one, group session, etc.)?**

The methods of delivery vary depending on the program. Examples of the methods are listed but not limited to the following: small group, think, pair, share, turn and talk to your partner, large group, and individual instructional interventions. For the after school tutorial program the methods of delivery were PARCC Prep for Language Arts and Math. Small group sessions, faculty meetings, SLC, PTA, parent workshops and email were also utilized as a means of delivery.

### **8. How did the school structure the interventions?**

The school structured the interventions based on needs of the students, community goals, and guidelines of the school, district, and state assessments. A portion of the staff worked with the special educator and child study team case manager to establish and institute intervention strategies based on student need. The I&RS Process, conferences with parents/guardians & students, collaboration of staff to identify and address students' individual needs, collaboration with the Guidance Counselor and Health and Social Services Coordinator (HSSC), individual Student Plans and Individual Educational Plans, referrals to outside agencies, and professional Development were also utilized to structure interventions.

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

### 9. How frequently did students receive instructional interventions?

The students were able to receiving instruction that was on-going and specifically based on their needs, which was daily, as indicated in their IEPs and as needed.

### 10. What technologies did the school use to support the program?

As means to support the program, the school provided Smart Boards, Smart Responders, and individual classroom sets of laptops. chrome books and computers. School Messenger, GoogleDocs, PowerSchool, OnCourse Lesson Planning System, and the curriculum of My Math, Read 180 and System 44 were also utilized.

### 11. Did the technology contribute to the success of the program and, if so, how?

Yes, indeed the technology contributed to the success of the program. Whereas, technology was an intricate part of the program our students are computer savvy and have begun taking math assessments on the computer. Their scores are beginning to rise as a result of being taught in a manner that is more comfortable and relevant to them.

*\*Provide a separate response for each question.*

## Evaluation of 2014-2015 Student Performance

### *State Assessments-Partially Proficient*

Provide the number of students at each grade level listed below who scored partially proficient on state assessments for two years or more in English Language Arts and Mathematics, and the interventions the students received.

English Language Arts	2013-2014	2014-2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions <i>did</i> or <i>did not</i> result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Grade 4	53		After School Programs: PARCC Tutorial Summer Enrichment Program: Title I Guided Reading Test Prep Take Home Packets	Results are Pending: October 2015

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

			Leveled Classroom Libraries Portfolios Interactive Smart Boards Differentiated Instruction Saturday Detention Mentoring Club	
Grade 5	47		After School Programs: PARCC Tutorial Summer Enrichment Program: Title I Guided Reading Test Prep Take Home Packets Leveled Classroom Libraries Portfolios Interactive Smart Boards Differentiated Instruction Saturday Detention Mentoring Club	Results are Pending: October 2015

Mathematics	2013-2014	2014-2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions <i>did</i> or <i>did not</i> result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Grade 4	39		After School Programs: PARCC Tutorial Summer Enrichment Program: Title I Test Prep Take Home Packets Differentiated Instruction Interactive Smart Boards Math Manipulatives Interactive Math Centers My Math Saturday Detention Mentoring Club	Results are Pending: October 2015
Grade 5	40		After School Programs: PARCC Tutorial Summer Enrichment Program: Title I Test Prep Take Home Packets Differentiated Instruction Interactive Smart Boards Math Manipulatives	Results are Pending: October 2015

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

			Interactive Math Centers My Math Saturday Detention Mentoring Club	
--	--	--	---	--

### Evaluation of 2014-2015 Student Performance *Non-Tested Grades – Alternative Assessments (Below Level)*

Provide the number of students at each non-tested grade level listed below who performed below level on a standardized and/or developmentally appropriate assessment, and the interventions the students received.

English Language Arts	2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions <i>did or did not</i> result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Pre-Kindergarten	27	13	GOLD ASSESSMENT	Unfortunately, the interventions did not result in proficiency because of the lack of rigor and incorrect use of data. Teachers also require additional professional development in the curriculum, student engagement and Smartboard usage.
Kindergarten	33	10	READING WONDERS BENCHMARK ASSESSMENTS	Unfortunately, the interventions did not result in proficiency because of the lack of rigor and incorrect use of data. Teachers also require additional professional development in the curriculum, student engagement and Smartboard usage.
Grade 1	22	9	READING WONDERS BENCHMARK ASSESSMENTS	Unfortunately, the interventions did not result in proficiency because of the lack of rigor and incorrect use of data. Teachers also require additional professional development in the curriculum, student engagement and Smartboard usage.
Grade 2	31	24	READING WONDERS BENCHMARK ASSESSMENTS AFTERSCHOOL TUTORIAL	Unfortunately, the interventions did not result in proficiency because of the lack of rigor and incorrect use of data. Teachers also require additional professional development in the curriculum, student engagement and Smartboard usage.
Mathematics	2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions provided <i>did or did not</i> result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).

**SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)***

Pre-Kindergarten	27	11	GOLD ASSESSMENT	Unfortunately, the interventions did not result in proficiency because of the lack of rigor and incorrect use of data. Teachers also require additional professional development in the curriculum, student engagement and Smartboard usage.
Kindergarten	32	7	MY MATH	Unfortunately, the interventions did not result in proficiency because of the lack of rigor and incorrect use of data. Teachers also require additional professional development in the curriculum, student engagement and Smartboard usage.
Grade 1	20	7	MY MATH	Unfortunately, the interventions did not result in proficiency because of the lack of rigor and incorrect use of data. Teachers also require additional professional development in the curriculum, student engagement and Smartboard usage.
Grade 2	29	18	MY MATH	Unfortunately, the interventions did not result in proficiency because of the lack of rigor and incorrect use of data. Teachers also require additional professional development in the curriculum, student engagement and Smartboard usage.

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

### Evaluation of 2014-2015 Interventions and Strategies

#### Interventions to Increase Student Achievement – Implemented in 2014-2015

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Read180 Reading Wonders	Results Pending	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PARCC Testing</li> <li>• Writing Portfolios</li> <li>• Lesson Plans</li> <li>• Walkthroughs</li> <li>• Formative Assessments</li> <li>• Grade Level Distribution</li> <li>• SRI tests</li> <li>• Unit Tests</li> </ul>	<p>PARCC – measures proficiency based on the Common Core State Standards for the English Language Arts (ELA). These results are expected to provide strengths and weaknesses in the content represented by specific CCSS. Students will also compare to students with the same socio-economic characteristics. This data will give us a valid comparable population.</p> <p>There is an increase in grades obtained by students</p> <p>Data analysis showed that 80% of Students with disabilities experienced growth in the Read180 Program. The majority gained between 100 to 200 points.</p>
		Inclusion Program	Results Pending		<p>PARCC – measures proficiency based on the Common Core State Standards for the English Language Arts (ELA). These results are expected to provide strengths and</p>

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)												
					<p>weaknesses in the content represented by specific CCSS. Students will also compare to students with the same socio-economic characteristics. This data will give us a valid comparable population.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution:</b></p> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>54</td><td>24</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>63</td><td>15</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>51</td><td>11</td></tr></table>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	54	24	4	63	15	5	51	11
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)															
3	54	24															
4	63	15															
5	51	11															
Math	Students with Disabilities	My Math-	Results pending	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PARCC Testing</li><li>• Lesson Plans</li><li>• Walkthroughs</li><li>• Formative Assessments</li><li>• Grade Level Distribution</li><li>• Unit Tests</li></ul>	<p>Results are expected to measure student achievement using Common Core State Standards.</p> <p>Unit testing was a vehicle to measure progress as the content was taught, unfortunately, there was a lack of uniformity in administering the test. Some teachers administered the test with paper and pencil others administered with paper and pencil</p> <p>Due to a lack of uniformity in administration of tests data was not valid. Digital administration of tests will be mandated in order to facilitate capturing valid and reliable data.</p>												

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)												
					<p>There is a slight increase in the grade distribution of the previous year</p> <p>Common Planning periods and grade level meeting are forums when student work was examined. Samples of student work revealed that student were able to master some core standards, however teachers are in need of more training on the protocols for examining student work.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution:</b></p> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>59</td><td>18</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>56</td><td>14</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>45</td><td>15</td></tr></table>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	59	18	4	56	14	5	45	15
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)															
3	59	18															
4	56	14															
5	45	15															
ELA	Homeless	Read180 Reading Wonders	Results Pending	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>PARCC Testing</li><li>Writing Portfolios</li></ul>	PARCC – measures proficiency based on the Common Core State Standards for the English Language Arts (ELA). These results are												



## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
		Inclusion Program	Results Pending	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lesson Plans</li> <li>• Walkthroughs</li> <li>• Formative Assessments</li> <li>• Grade Level Distribution</li> <li>• SRI tests</li> <li>• Unit Tests</li> </ul>	<p>expected to provide strengths and weaknesses in the content represented by specific CCSS. Students will also compare to students with the same socio-economic characteristics. This data will give us a valid comparable population.</p> <p>There is an increase in grades obtained by students</p> <p>Data analysis showed that 80% of Students with disabilities experienced growth in the Read180 Program. The majority gained between 100 to 200 points.</p> <p>PARCC – measures proficiency based on the Common Core State Standards for the English Language Arts (ELA). These results are expected to provide strengths and weaknesses in the content represented by specific CCSS. Students will also compare to students with the same socio-economic characteristics. This data will give us a valid comparable population.</p>

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)												
					<div>Grade Distribution:</div> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>54</td><td>24</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>63</td><td>15</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>51</td><td>11</td></tr></table>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	54	24	4	63	15	5	51	11
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)															
3	54	24															
4	63	15															
5	51	11															
Math	Homeless	My Math-	Results pending	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PARCC Testing</li><li>• Lesson Plans</li><li>• Walkthroughs</li><li>• Formative Assessments</li><li>• Grade Level Distribution</li><li>• Unit Tests</li></ul>	<p>Results are expected to measure student achievement using Common Core State Standards.</p> <p>Unit testing was a vehicle to measure progress as the content was taught, unfortunately, there was a lack of uniformity in administering the test. Some teachers administered the test with paper and pencil others administered with paper and pencil</p> <p>Due to a lack of uniformity in administration of tests data was not valid. Digital administration of tests will be mandated in order to facilitate capturing valid and reliable data.</p> <p>There is a slight increase in the grade distribution of the previous year</p>												

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)												
					<p>Common Planning periods and grade level meeting are forums when student work was examined. Samples of student work revealed that student were able to master some core standards, however teachers are in need of more training on the protocols for examining student work.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution:</b></p> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>59</td><td>18</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>56</td><td>14</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>45</td><td>15</td></tr></table>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	59	18	4	56	14	5	45	15
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)															
3	59	18															
4	56	14															
5	45	15															
ELA	Migrant	Read180 Reading Wonders	Results Pending	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PARCC Testing</li><li>• Writing Portfolios</li><li>• Lesson Plans</li><li>• Walkthroughs</li><li>• Formative Assessments</li><li>• Grade Level</li></ul>	PARCC – measures proficiency based on the Common Core State Standards for the English Language Arts (ELA). These results are expected to provide strengths and weaknesses in the content represented by specific CCSS. Students will also compare to students with the same socio-economic characteristics. This data will give us a valid comparable population.												

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)						
		Inclusion Program	Results Pending	Distribution <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>SRI tests</li><li>Unit Tests</li></ul>	<p>There is an increase in grades obtained by students</p> <p>Data analysis showed that 80% of Students with disabilities experienced growth in the Read180 Program. The majority gained between 100 to 200 points.</p> <p>PARCC – measures proficiency based on the Common Core State Standards for the English Language Arts (ELA). These results are expected to provide strengths and weaknesses in the content represented by specific CCSS. Students will also compare to students with the same socio-economic characteristics. This data will give us a valid comparable population.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution:</b></p> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>54</td><td>24</td></tr></table>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	54	24
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)									
3	54	24									

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)		
					4	63	15
					5	51	11
Math	Migrant	My Math-	Results pending	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PARCC Testing</li><li>• Lesson Plans</li><li>• Walkthroughs</li><li>• Formative Assessments</li><li>• Grade Level Distribution</li><li>• Unit Tests</li></ul>	<p>Results are expected to measure student achievement using Common Core State Standards.</p> <p>Unit testing was a vehicle to measure progress as the content was taught, unfortunately, there was a lack of uniformity in administering the test. Some teachers administered the test with paper and pencil others administered with paper and pencil Due to a lack of uniformity in administration of tests data was not valid. Digital administration of tests will be mandated in order to facilitate capturing valid and reliable data.</p> <p>There is a slight increase in the grade distribution of the previous year</p> <p>Common Planning periods and grade level</p>		

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)												
					<p>meeting are forums when student work was examined. Samples of student work revealed that student were able to master some core standards, however teachers are in need of more training on the protocols for examining student work.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution:</b></p> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>59</td><td>18</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>56</td><td>14</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>45</td><td>15</td></tr></table>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	59	18	4	56	14	5	45	15
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)															
3	59	18															
4	56	14															
5	45	15															
ELA	ELLs	Read180 Reading Wonders	Results Pending	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PARCC Testing</li><li>• Writing Portfolios</li><li>• Lesson Plans</li><li>• Walkthroughs</li><li>• Formative Assessments</li><li>• Grade Level Distribution</li><li>• SRI tests</li><li>• Unit Tests</li></ul>	<p>PARCC – measures proficiency based on the Common Core State Standards for the English Language Arts (ELA). These results are expected to provide strengths and weaknesses in the content represented by specific CCSS. Students will also compare to students with the same socio-economic characteristics. This data will give us a valid comparable population.</p> <p>There is an increase in grades obtained by</p>												

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)												
		Inclusion Program	Results Pending		<p>students</p> <p>Data analysis showed that 80% of Students with disabilities experienced growth in the Read180 Program. The majority gained between 100 to 200 points.</p> <p>PARCC – measures proficiency based on the Common Core State Standards for the English Language Arts (ELA). These results are expected to provide strengths and weaknesses in the content represented by specific CCSS. Students will also compare to students with the same socio-economic characteristics. This data will give us a valid comparable population.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution:</b></p> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>54</td><td>24</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>63</td><td>15</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>51</td><td>11</td></tr></table>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	54	24	4	63	15	5	51	11
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)															
3	54	24															
4	63	15															
5	51	11															
Math	ELLs	My Math-	Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>PARCC Testing</li></ul>	Results are expected to measure student achievement using Common Core State												

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
			pending	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lesson Plans</li> <li>• Walkthroughs</li> <li>• Formative Assessments</li> <li>• Grade Level Distribution</li> <li>• Unit Tests</li> </ul>	<p>Standards.</p> <p>Unit testing was a vehicle to measure progress as the content was taught, unfortunately, there was a lack of uniformity in administering the test. Some teachers administered the test with paper and pencil others administered with paper and pencil Due to a lack of uniformity in administration of tests data was not valid. Digital administration of tests will be mandated in order to facilitate capturing valid and reliable data.</p> <p>There is a slight increase in the grade distribution of the previous year</p> <p>Common Planning periods and grade level meeting are forums when student work was examined. Samples of student work revealed that student were able to master some core standards, however teachers are in need of more training on the protocols for examining</p>



## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)												
					<p>student work.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution:</b></p> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>59</td><td>18</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>56</td><td>14</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>45</td><td>15</td></tr></table>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	59	18	4	56	14	5	45	15
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)															
3	59	18															
4	56	14															
5	45	15															
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Read180 Reading Wonders	Results Pending	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PARCC Testing</li><li>• Writing Portfolios</li><li>• Lesson Plans</li><li>• Walkthroughs</li><li>• Formative Assessments</li><li>• Grade Level Distribution</li><li>• SRI tests</li><li>• Unit Tests</li></ul>	<p>PARCC – measures proficiency based on the Common Core State Standards for the English Language Arts (ELA). These results are expected to provide strengths and weaknesses in the content represented by specific CCSS. Students will also compare to students with the same socio-economic characteristics. This data will give us a valid comparable population.</p> <p>There is an increase in grades obtained by students</p> <p>Data analysis showed that 80% of Students with disabilities experienced growth</p>												

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)												
		Inclusion Program	Results Pending		<p>in the Read180 Program. The majority gained between 100 to 200 points.</p> <p>PARCC – measures proficiency based on the Common Core State Standards for the English Language Arts (ELA). These results are expected to provide strengths and weaknesses in the content represented by specific CCSS. Students will also compare to students with the same socio-economic characteristics. This data will give us a valid comparable population.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution:</b></p> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>54</td><td>24</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>63</td><td>15</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>51</td><td>11</td></tr></table>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	54	24	4	63	15	5	51	11
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)															
3	54	24															
4	63	15															
5	51	11															
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	My Math-	Results pending	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PARCC Testing</li><li>• Lesson Plans</li><li>• Walkthroughs</li><li>• Formative Assessments</li><li>• Grade Level</li></ul>	<p>Results are expected to measure student achievement using Common Core State Standards.</p> <p>Unit testing was a vehicle to measure progress as the content was taught,</p>												

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)			
				<div>Distribution</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Unit Tests</li></ul>	<p>unfortunately, there was a lack of uniformity in administering the test. Some teachers administered the test with paper and pencil others administered with paper and pencil</p> <p>Due to a lack of uniformity in administration of tests data was not valid. Digital administration of tests will be mandated in order to facilitate capturing valid and reliable data.</p> <p>There is a slight increase in the grade distribution of the previous year</p> <p>Common Planning periods and grade level meeting are forums when student work was examined. Samples of student work revealed that student were able to master some core standards, however teachers are in need of more training on the protocols for examining student work.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution:</b></p> <table><tr><td><b>Grade</b></td><td><b>At Benchmark</b></td><td><b>Below Benchmark</b></td></tr></table>	<b>Grade</b>	<b>At Benchmark</b>	<b>Below Benchmark</b>
<b>Grade</b>	<b>At Benchmark</b>	<b>Below Benchmark</b>						

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)											
						(A, B, C)	(D, F)									
					3	59	18									
					4	56	14									
					5	45	15									
ELA	Reading Wonders	Kagan Workshops	Results Pending	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PARCC Testing</li><li>• Writing Portfolios</li><li>• Lesson Plans</li><li>• Walkthroughs</li><li>• Formative Assessments</li><li>• Grade Level Distribution</li><li>• SRI tests</li><li>• Unit Tests</li></ul>	<p>PARCC – measures proficiency based on the Common Core State Standards for the English Language Arts (ELA). These results are expected to provide strengths and weaknesses in the content represented by specific CCSS. Students will also compare to students with the same socio-economic factors. This data will give us a valid comparable population.</p> <p>Due to a lack of uniformity in administration of tests data was not valid. Digital administration of tests will be mandated in order to facilitate capturing valid and reliable data.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution:</b></p> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>54</td><td>24</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>63</td><td>15</td></tr></table>			Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	54	24	4	63	15
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)														
3	54	24														
4	63	15														

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)														
					5	51	11												
Math	My Math	Kagan Workshops	Results Pending	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PARCC Testing</li><li>• Lesson Plans</li><li>• Walkthroughs</li><li>• Formative Assessments</li><li>• Grade Level Distribution</li><li>• Unit Tests</li></ul>	<p>Pre/Posttest: Their scores improved by 18+ points from pre to the post tests for 86 % of the students. The remaining students’ scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution:</b></p> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>59</td><td>18</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>56</td><td>14</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>45</td><td>15</td></tr></table>			Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	59	18	4	56	14	5	45	15
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)																	
3	59	18																	
4	56	14																	
5	45	15																	

### Extended Day/Year Interventions – Implemented in 2014-2015 to Address Academic Deficiencies

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	ELA Afterschool Tutoring	Results Pending	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PARCC Testing</li> <li>• Writing Portfolios</li> </ul>	Proficiency level provided by PARCC test based on Common Core State Standards

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)												
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Lesson Plans</li><li>• Walkthroughs</li><li>• Formative Assessments</li><li>• Grade Level Distribution</li><li>• SRI tests</li><li>• Unit Tests</li></ul>	<p>(October 2015)</p> <p>Pre/Posttest: Students were most comfortable responsible to responding to multiple choice questions than short constructed response or open ended questions. Their scores improved by 10+ points from pre to the post tests for 82 % of the students. The remaining students’ scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution:</b></p> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>54</td><td>24</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>63</td><td>15</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>51</td><td>11</td></tr></table>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	54	24	4	63	15	5	51	11
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)															
3	54	24															
4	63	15															
5	51	11															
Math	Students with Disabilities	Math Afterschool Tutoring	Results Pending	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PARCC Testing</li><li>• Lesson Plans</li><li>• Walkthroughs</li><li>• Formative Assessments</li><li>• Grade Level Distribution</li><li>• Unit Tests</li></ul>	PARCC – measures proficiency based on the Common Core State Standards for the English Language Arts (ELA). These results are expected to provide strengths and weaknesses in the content represented by specific CCSS. Students will also compare to students with the same socio-economic characteristics. This data will give us a valid comparable population.												

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)												
					<p>Pre/Posttest: Their scores improved by 18+ points from pre to the post tests for 86 % of the students. The remaining students’ scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution:</b></p> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>59</td><td>18</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>56</td><td>14</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>45</td><td>15</td></tr></table>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	59	18	4	56	14	5	45	15
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)															
3	59	18															
4	56	14															
5	45	15															
ELA	Homeless	ELA Afterschool Tutoring	Results Pending	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PARCC Testing</li><li>• Writing Portfolios</li><li>• Lesson Plans</li><li>• Walkthroughs</li><li>• Formative Assessments</li><li>• Grade Level Distribution</li><li>• SRI tests</li><li>• Unit Tests</li></ul>	<p>Proficiency level provided by PARCC test based on Common Core State Standards (October 2015)</p> <p>Pre/Posttest: Students were most comfortable responsible to responding to multiple choice questions than short constructed response or open ended questions. Their scores improved by 10+ points from pre to the post tests for 82 % of the students. The remaining students’ scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p>												

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)												
					<div>Grade Distributions:</div> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>54</td><td>24</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>63</td><td>15</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>51</td><td>11</td></tr></table>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	54	24	4	63	15	5	51	11
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)															
3	54	24															
4	63	15															
5	51	11															
Math	Homeless	Math Afterschool Tutoring	Results Pending	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PARCC Testing</li><li>• Lesson Plans</li><li>• Walkthroughs</li><li>• Formative Assessments</li><li>• Grade Level Distribution</li><li>• Unit Tests</li></ul>	<p>PARCC – measures proficiency based on the Common Core State Standards for the English Language Arts (ELA). These results are expected to provide strengths and weaknesses in the content represented by specific CCSS. Students will also compare to students with the same socio-economic characteristics. This data will give us a valid comparable population.</p> <p>Pre/Posttest: Their scores improved by 18+ points from pre to the post tests for 86 % of the students. The remaining students’ scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>59</td><td>18</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>56</td><td>14</td></tr></table>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	59	18	4	56	14			
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)															
3	59	18															
4	56	14															



## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)														
					5	45	15												
ELA	Migrant	ELA Afterschool Tutoring	Results Pending	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PARCC Testing</li><li>• Writing Portfolios</li><li>• Lesson Plans</li><li>• Walkthroughs</li><li>• Formative Assessments</li><li>• Grade Level Distribution</li><li>• SRI tests</li><li>• Unit Tests</li></ul>	<p>Proficiency level provided by PARCC test based on Common Core State Standards (October 2015)</p> <p>Pre/Posttest: Students were most comfortable responsible to responding to multiple choice questions than short constructed response or open ended questions. Their scores improved by 10+ points from pre to the post tests for 82 % of the students. The remaining students’ scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution:</b></p> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>54</td><td>24</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>63</td><td>15</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>51</td><td>11</td></tr></table>			Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	54	24	4	63	15	5	51	11
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)																	
3	54	24																	
4	63	15																	
5	51	11																	
Math	Migrant	Math Afterschool Tutoring	Results Pending	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PARCC Testing</li><li>• Lesson Plans</li><li>• Walkthroughs</li></ul>	PARCC – measures proficiency based on the Common Core State Standards for the English Language Arts (ELA). These results are														

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)												
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Formative Assessments</li><li>Grade Level Distribution</li><li>Unit Tests</li></ul>	<p>expected to provide strengths and weaknesses in the content represented by specific CCSS. Students will also compare to students with the same socio-economic characteristics. This data will give us a valid comparable population.</p> <p>Pre/Posttest: Their scores improved by 18+ points from pre to the post tests for 86 % of the students. The remaining students’ scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution:</b></p> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>59</td><td>18</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>56</td><td>14</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>45</td><td>15</td></tr></table>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	59	18	4	56	14	5	45	15
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)															
3	59	18															
4	56	14															
5	45	15															
ELA	ELLs	ELA Afterschool Tutoring	Results Pending	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>PARCC Testing</li><li>Writing Portfolios</li><li>Lesson Plans</li><li>Walkthroughs</li><li>Formative</li></ul>	<p>Proficiency level provided by PARCC test based on Common Core State Standards (October 2015)</p> <p>Pre/Posttest: Students were most comfortable responsible to responding to</p>												

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)												
				Assessments <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Grade Level Distribution</li><li>SRI tests</li><li>Unit Tests</li></ul>	<p>multiple choice questions than short constructed response or open ended questions. Their scores improved by 10+ points from pre to the post tests for 82 % of the students. The remaining students’ scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution:</b></p> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>54</td><td>24</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>63</td><td>15</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>51</td><td>11</td></tr></table>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	54	24	4	63	15	5	51	11
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)															
3	54	24															
4	63	15															
5	51	11															
Math	ELLs	Math Afterschool Tutoring	Results Pending	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>PARCC Testing</li><li>Lesson Plans</li><li>Walkthroughs</li><li>Formative Assessments</li><li>Grade Level Distribution</li><li>Unit Tests</li></ul>	<p>PARCC – measures proficiency based on the Common Core State Standards for the English Language Arts (ELA). These results are expected to provide strengths and weaknesses in the content represented by specific CCSS. Students will also compare to students with the same socio-economic characteristics. This data will give us a valid comparable population.</p> <p>Pre/Posttest: Their scores improved by 18+ points from pre to the post tests for 86 % of the students. The remaining students’ scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p>												

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)												
					<div>Grade Distribution:</div> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>59</td><td>18</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>56</td><td>14</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>45</td><td>15</td></tr></table>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	59	18	4	56	14	5	45	15
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)															
3	59	18															
4	56	14															
5	45	15															
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	ELA Afterschool Tutoring	Results Pending	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PARCC Testing</li><li>• Writing Portfolios</li><li>• Lesson Plans</li><li>• Walkthroughs</li><li>• Formative Assessments</li><li>• Grade Level Distribution</li><li>• SRI tests</li><li>• Unit Tests</li></ul>	<div>Proficiency level provided by PARCC test based on Common Core State Standards (October 2015)</div> <div>Pre/Posttest: Students were most comfortable responsible to responding to multiple choice questions than short constructed response or open ended questions. Their scores improved by 10+ points from pre to the post tests for 82 % of the students. The remaining students’ scores were impacted by poor attendance.</div> <div>Grade Distribution:</div> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>54</td><td>24</td></tr></table>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	54	24						
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)															
3	54	24															

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)														
					4	63	15												
					5	51	11												
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Math Afterschool Tutoring		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PARCC Testing</li><li>• Lesson Plans</li><li>• Walkthroughs</li><li>• Formative Assessments</li><li>• Grade Level Distribution</li><li>• Unit Tests</li></ul>	<p>PARCC – measures proficiency based on the Common Core State Standards for the English Language Arts (ELA). These results are expected to provide strengths and weaknesses in the content represented by specific CCSS. Students will also compare to students with the same socio-economic characteristics. This data will give us a valid comparable population.</p> <p>Pre/Posttest: Their scores improved by 18+ points from pre to the post tests for 86 % of the students. The remaining students’ scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution:</b></p> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>59</td><td>18</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>56</td><td>14</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>45</td><td>15</td></tr></table>			Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	59	18	4	56	14	5	45	15
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)																	
3	59	18																	
4	56	14																	
5	45	15																	

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)			
ELA		Kagan Workshops geared towards increasing student engagement.  ELA Department training	Pending results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PARCC Testing</li><li>• Writing Portfolios</li><li>• Lesson Plans</li><li>• Walkthroughs</li><li>• Formative Assessments</li><li>• Grade Level Distribution</li><li>• SRI tests</li><li>• Unit Tests</li></ul>	<p>PARCC – measures proficiency based on the Common Core State Standards for the English Language Arts (ELA). These results are expected to provide strengths and weaknesses in the content represented by specific CCSS. Students will also compare to students with the same socio-economic factors. This data will give us a valid comparable population.</p> <p>Due to a lack of uniformity in administration of tests data was not valid. Digital administration of tests will be mandated in order to facilitate capturing valid and reliable data.</p> <p>Pre/Posttest: Students were most comfortable responsible to responding to multiple choice questions than short constructed response or open ended questions. Their scores improved by 10+ points from pre to the post tests for 82 % of the students. The remaining students’ scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution:</b></p> <table><tr><td><b>Grade</b></td><td><b>At Benchmark</b></td><td><b>Below Benchmark</b></td></tr></table>	<b>Grade</b>	<b>At Benchmark</b>	<b>Below Benchmark</b>
<b>Grade</b>	<b>At Benchmark</b>	<b>Below Benchmark</b>						

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)														
						(A, B, C)	(D, F)												
					3	54	24												
					4	63	15												
					5	51	11												
Math		<p>Kagan Workshops geared towards increasing student engagement.</p> <p>Math Department training and McGraw Hill Consultants My Math training</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• PARCC Testing</li><li>• Lesson Plans</li><li>• Walkthroughs</li><li>• Formative Assessments</li><li>• Grade Level Distribution</li><li>• Unit Tests</li></ul>	<p>PARCC – measures proficiency based on the Common Core State Standards for the English Language Arts (ELA). These results are expected to provide strengths and weaknesses in the content represented by specific CCSS. Students will also compare to students with the same socio-economic factors. This data will give us a valid comparable population.</p> <p>Pre/Posttest: Their scores improved by 18+ points from pre to the post tests for 86 % of the students. The remaining students’ scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution:</b></p> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>59</td><td>18</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>56</td><td>14</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>45</td><td>15</td></tr></table>			Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	59	18	4	56	14	5	45	15
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)																	
3	59	18																	
4	56	14																	
5	45	15																	

**SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)***

<b>1 Content</b>	<b>2 Group</b>	<b>3 Intervention</b>	<b>4 Effective Yes-No</b>	<b>5 Documentation of Effectiveness</b>	<b>6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)</b>



## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

### Evaluation of 2014-2015 Interventions and Strategies

#### Professional Development – Implemented in 2014-2015

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	<p>Kagan structures and Strategies</p> <p>Dyslexia</p> <p>Reading Wonders training-from McGraw Hill</p> <p>NJCIE training of consultative teachers</p>	Pending	<p>PARCC TESTING</p> <p>Formal and informal evaluations</p>	<p>All teachers attended the Kagan workshop series. Formal evaluations and walkthrough show that there is evidence of the widespread use of the content from the workshops</p> <p>Teachers of students with disabilities attended the Dyslexia workshops to increase their capacity of recognizing this challenging literacy disorder. This requirement is relatively new more evidence is needed.</p> <p>All ELA teachers of students with disabilities attended multiple workshops offered by consultants and ELA Department</p> <p>All Consultative teachers were trained by NJCIE due to the recent introduction of the program more data is needed.</p> <p>Pre/Posttest: Students were most comfortable responsible to responding to multiple choice questions than short constructed response or open ended questions. Their scores improved by 10+ points from pre to the post tests for 82 % of</p>

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)												
					<p>the students. The remaining students’ scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution:</b></p> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>54</td><td>24</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>63</td><td>15</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>51</td><td>11</td></tr></table>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	54	24	4	63	15	5	51	11
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)															
3	54	24															
4	63	15															
5	51	11															
Math	Students with Disabilities	My Math Workshops by consultants and Math Supervisors.			<p>Pre/Posttest: Their scores improved by 18+ points from pre to the post tests for 86 % of the students. The remaining students’ scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution:</b></p> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>59</td><td>18</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>56</td><td>14</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>45</td><td>15</td></tr></table>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	59	18	4	56	14	5	45	15
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)															
3	59	18															
4	56	14															
5	45	15															

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)												
ELA	Homeless	N/A No homeless students for this year			<p>Pre/Posttest: Students were most comfortable responsible to responding to multiple choice questions than short constructed response or open ended questions. Their scores improved by 10+ points from pre to the post tests for 82 % of the students. The remaining students’ scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution:</b></p> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>54</td><td>24</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>63</td><td>15</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>51</td><td>11</td></tr></table>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	54	24	4	63	15	5	51	11
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)															
3	54	24															
4	63	15															
5	51	11															
Math	Homeless	N/A No homeless students for this year			<p>Pre/Posttest: Their scores improved by 18+ points from pre to the post tests for 86 % of the students. The remaining students’ scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution:</b></p> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>59</td><td>18</td></tr></table>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	59	18						
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)															
3	59	18															

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)														
					4	56	14												
					5	45	15												
ELA	Migrant	N/A No migrant students for this year			Pre/Posttest: Students were most comfortable responsible to responding to multiple choice questions than short constructed response or open ended questions. Their scores improved by 10+ points from pre to the post tests for 82 % of the students. The remaining students’ scores were impacted by poor attendance.  Grade Distribution: <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>54</td><td>24</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>63</td><td>15</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>51</td><td>11</td></tr></table>			Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	54	24	4	63	15	5	51	11
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)																	
3	54	24																	
4	63	15																	
5	51	11																	
Math	Migrant	N/A No migrant students for this year			Pre/Posttest: Their scores improved by 18+ points from pre to the post tests for 86 % of the students. The remaining students’ scores were impacted by poor attendance.														

**SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)**

[illegible]

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)												
					<p>comfortable responsible to responding to multiple choice questions than short constructed response or open ended questions. Their scores improved by 10+ points from pre to the post tests for 82 % of the students. The remaining students’ scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution:</b></p> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>54</td><td>24</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>63</td><td>15</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>51</td><td>11</td></tr></table>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	54	24	4	63	15	5	51	11
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)															
3	54	24															
4	63	15															
5	51	11															
Math	ELL	Push-in model	Pending	<p>PARCC Testing</p> <p>Math Unit Testing</p>	<p>PARCC – measures proficiency based on the Common Core State Standards for the English Language Arts (ELA). These results are expected to provide strengths and weaknesses in the content represented by specific CCSS. Students will also compare to students with the same socio-economic factors. This data will give us a valid comparable population.</p> <p>Unit testing was a vehicle to measure progress as the content was taught, unfortunately, there was a lack of uniformity in administering the test. Some teachers</p>												

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)												
					<p>administered the test with paper and pencil others administered with paper and pencil Due to a lack of uniformity in administration of tests data was not valid. Digital</p> <p>administration of tests will be mandated in order to facilitate capturing valid and reliable data.</p> <p>Pre/Posttest: Their scores improved by 18+ points from pre to the post tests for 86 % of the students. The remaining students’ scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution:</b></p> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>59</td><td>18</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>56</td><td>14</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>45</td><td>15</td></tr></table>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	59	18	4	56	14	5	45	15
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)															
3	59	18															
4	56	14															
5	45	15															
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Reading Wonders Workshops presented by McGraw Hill	Pending		Due to the novelty of the program more data is needed to determine the effectiveness of the Push-in Model.												

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)									
		consultants and the ELA Department		PARCC Testing	<p>PARCC – measures proficiency based on the Common Core State Standards for the English Language Arts (ELA). These results are expected to provide strengths and weaknesses in the content represented by specific CCSS. Students will also compare to students with the same socio-economic factors. This data will give us a valid comparable population.</p> <p>Pre/Posttest: Students were most comfortable responsible to responding to multiple choice questions than short constructed response or open ended questions. Their scores improved by 10+ points from pre to the post tests for 82 % of the students. The remaining students’ scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution:</b></p> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>54</td><td>24</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>63</td><td>15</td></tr></table>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	54	24	4	63	15
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)												
3	54	24												
4	63	15												



## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)															
					5	51	11													
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	My Math Workshops presented by McGraw-Hill Consultants and the District’s Math Department.	Pending		<p>Pre/Posttest: Their scores improved by 18+ points from pre to the post tests for 86 % of the students. The remaining students’ scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution:</b></p> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>59</td><td>18</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>56</td><td>14</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>45</td><td>15</td></tr></table>				Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	59	18	4	56	14	5	45	15
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)																		
3	59	18																		
4	56	14																		
5	45	15																		
ELA	ELA Teachers	Reading Wonders Workshops presented by McGraw Hill consultants and the ELA Department	Pending	PARCC Testing	<p>Pre/Posttest: Students were most comfortable responsible to responding to multiple choice questions than short constructed response or open ended questions. Their scores improved by 10+ points from pre to the post tests for 82 % of the students. The remaining students’ scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p>															

**SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)**

[illegible]

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)		
					4	56	14
					5	45	15

### *Family and Community Engagement* Implemented in 2014-2015

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Parent Workshops on ELA Common Core Standards  Parent Workshops on ELA PARCC testing and tips on How Parents can help children be successful.	Yes	Sign-in Sheets Surveys	Considerable Parents attendance Government Programs  Parent sign-in sheets indicated that there was a 35% increase in parents attending PTA meetings and parent workshops for the 2014-2015 school year when compared to the 2013-2015 school year.
Math	Students with Disabilities	Parent Workshop on Math Common Core standards.  Parent Workshops on MATH PARCC testing		Sign-in sheets	Results are expected to measure student achievement using Common Core State Standards.  Parent sign-in sheets indicated that there was a 35% increase in parents attending PTA

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
		and tips on How Parents can help children be successful.			meetings and parent workshops for the 2014-2015 school year when compared to the 2013-2015 school year.
ELA	Homeless	Parent Workshops on ELA Common Core Standards Parent Workshops on ELA PARCC testing and tips on How Parents can help children be successful.	Yes	Sign-in Sheets Surveys	Considerable Parents attendance Government Programs  Parent sign-in sheets indicated that there was a 35% increase in parents attending PTA meetings and parent workshops for the 2014-2015 school year when compared to the 2013-2015 school year.
Math	Homeless	Parent Workshop on Math Common Core standards.  Parent Workshops on MATH PARCC testing and tips on How Parents can help children be successful.		Sign-in sheets	Results are expected to measure student achievement using Common Core State Standards  Parent sign-in sheets indicated that there was a 35% increase in parents attending PTA meetings and parent workshops for the 2014-2015 school year when compared to the 2013-2015 school year.
ELA	Migrant	Parent Workshops on ELA Common Core Standards Parent Workshops on ELA PARCC testing and tips on How Parents can help children be successful.	Yes	Sign-in Sheets Surveys	Considerable Parents attendance Government Programs  Parent sign-in sheets indicated that there was a 35% increase in parents attending PTA meetings and parent workshops for the 2014-2015 school year when compared to the 2013-2015 school year.

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
Math	Migrant	<p>Parent Workshop on Math Common Core standards.</p> <p>Parent Workshops on MATH PARCC testing and tips on How Parents can help children be successful.</p>		Sign-in sheets	<p>Results are expected to measure student achievement using Common Core State Standards</p> <p>Parent sign-in sheets indicated that there was a 35% increase in parents attending PTA meetings and parent workshops for the 2014-2015 school year when compared to the 2013-2015 school year.</p>
ELA	ELLs	<p>Parent Workshops on ELA Common Core Standards</p> <p>Parent Workshops on ELA PARCC testing and tips on How Parents can help children be successful.</p>	Yes	Sign-in Sheets Surveys	<p>Considerable Parents attendance Government Programs</p> <p>Parent sign-in sheets indicated that there was a 35% increase in parents attending PTA meetings and parent workshops for the 2014-2015 school year when compared to the 2013-2015 school year.</p>
Math	ELLs	<p>Parent Workshop on Math Common Core standards.</p> <p>Parent Workshops on MATH PARCC testing and tips on How Parents can help children be successful.</p>		Sign-in sheets	<p>Results are expected to measure student achievement using Common Core State Standards</p> <p>Parent sign-in sheets indicated that there was a 35% increase in parents attending PTA meetings and parent workshops for the 2014-2015 school year when compared to the 2013-2015 school year.</p>
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Parent Workshops on ELA Common Core	Yes	Attendance Record	Considerable parent attendance

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
		Standards Parent Workshops on ELA PARCC testing and tips on How Parents can help children be successful.			Parent sign-in sheets indicated that there was a 35% increase in parents attending PTA meetings and parent workshops for the 2014- 2015 school year when compared to the 2013-2015 school year.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Parent Workshops on Math Common Core Standards Parent Workshops on ELA PARCC testing and tips on How Parents can help children be successful.	Yes	Attendance Record	Considerable Parent Attendance  Parent sign-in sheets indicated that there was a 35% increase in parents attending PTA meetings and parent workshops for the 2014- 2015 school year when compared to the 2013-2015 school year.
ELA	Parents/Guardians	Parent Workshops on ELA Common Core Standards Parent Workshops on ELA PARCC testing and tips on How Parents can help children be successful.	Yes	Attendance Record	Considerable Parent Attendance  Parent sign-in sheets indicated that there was a 35% increase in parents attending PTA meetings and parent workshops for the 2014- 2015 school year when compared to the 2013-2015 school year.
Math	Parents/Guardians	Parent Workshops on Math Common Core Standards Parent Workshops on ELA PARCC testing and tips on How Parents can help children be		Attendance Record	Considerable Parent Attendance  Parent sign-in sheets indicated that there was a 35% increase in parents attending PTA meetings and parent workshops for the 2014- 2015 school year when compared to the 2013-2015 school year.

**SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)***

<b>1 Content</b>	<b>2 Group</b>	<b>3 Intervention</b>	<b>4 Effective Yes-No</b>	<b>5 Documentation of Effectiveness</b>	<b>6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)</b>
		successful.			

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

### Principal's Certification

**The following certification must be completed by the principal of the school. Please Note:** Signatures must be kept on file at the school. A scanned copy of the Evaluation form, with all appropriate signatures, must be included as part of the submission of the Schoolwide Plan.

☐ I certify that the school's stakeholder/schoolwide committee conducted and completed the required Title I schoolwide evaluation as required for the completion of this Title I Schoolwide Plan. Per this evaluation, I concur with the information herein, including the identification of all programs and activities that were funded by Title I, Part A.

---

Principal's Name (Print)

---

Principal's Signature

---

Date



## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

*ESEA §1114(b)(1)(A): "A comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school [including taking into account the needs of migratory children as defined in §1309(2)] that is based on information which includes the achievement of children in relation to the State academic content standards and the State student academic achievement standards described in §1111(b)(1). "*

### 2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process *Data Collection and Analysis*

#### Multiple Measures Analyzed by the School in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process for 2015-2016

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)												
Academic Achievement – Reading	ELA Unit & Benchmark Assessments PARCC 3,4,5 Read 180-SRI System 44 Walkthrough Directed Rounds Grade Distribution	<p><b>After School Tutoring:</b>                      Pre/Posttest: Students were most comfortable responsible to responding to multiple choice questions than short constructed response or open ended questions. Their scores improved by 10+ points from pre to the post tests for 82 % of the students. The remaining students' scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution:</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td><td>54</td><td>24</td></tr> <tr> <td>4</td><td>63</td><td>15</td></tr> <tr> <td>5</td><td>51</td><td>11</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Awaiting PARCC Assessment Results: October 2015</b></p>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	54	24	4	63	15	5	51	11
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)												
3	54	24												
4	63	15												
5	51	11												
Academic Achievement - Writing	ELA Unit & Benchmark Assessments	<p><b>After School Tutoring:</b>                      Pre/Posttest: Students were most comfortable responsible to responding to multiple choice questions than short constructed response or open ended</p>												

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)												
	PARCC 3,4,5 Read 180-SRI System 44 Walkthrough Directed Rounds Grade Distribution	<p>questions. Their scores improved by 10+ points from pre to the post tests for 82 % of the students. The remaining students' scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution:</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td><td>54</td><td>24</td></tr> <tr> <td>4</td><td>63</td><td>15</td></tr> <tr> <td>5</td><td>51</td><td>11</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Awaiting PARCC Assessment Results: October 2015</b></p>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	54	24	4	63	15	5	51	11
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)												
3	54	24												
4	63	15												
5	51	11												
Academic Achievement - Mathematics	Math Unit & Benchmark Assessments PARCC 3,4,5 My Math E-assessments Walkthrough Directed Rounds Grade Distribution	<p><b>After School Tutoring:</b></p> <p>Pre/Posttest: Students were most comfortable responsible to responding to multiple choice questions than short constructed response or open ended questions. Their scores improved by 10+ points from pre to the post tests for 82 % of the students. The remaining students' scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution:</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td><td>59</td><td>18</td></tr> <tr> <td>4</td><td>56</td><td>14</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	59	18	4	56	14			
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)												
3	59	18												
4	56	14												

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)															
		5	45	15													
		Awaiting PARCC Assessment Results: October 2015															
Family and Community Engagement	Parent/Teacher Conferences/ PTA Meetings/SLC Meetings/Field Trips/Back to School/Open House/Family Night/Clubs	Parent sign-in sheets indicated that there was a 35% increase in parents attending PTA meetings and parent workshops for the 2014-2015 school year when compared to the 2013-2015 school year.															
Professional Development	In-District and Out-of-District Professional Development workshops/Consultants/Common Planning/Faculty and Grade Level Meetings/Surveys/OnCourse Lesson Planning	<p>These measures indicate teacher’s need for ongoing relevant training. Through collaboration and articulation in faculty meetings, common planning meetings, and workshops these measures indicate teacher’s ongoing need for improvement.</p> <p><b>After School Tutoring ELA:</b></p> <p>Pre/Posttest: Students were most comfortable responding to multiple choice questions than short constructed response or open ended questions. Their scores improved by 10+ points from pre to the post tests for 82 % of the students. The remaining students’ scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution ELA:</b></p> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>54</td><td>24</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>63</td><td>15</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>51</td><td>11</td></tr></table>				Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	54	24	4	63	15	5	51	11
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)															
3	54	24															
4	63	15															
5	51	11															

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)												
		<p><b>After School Tutoring Math:</b></p> <p>Pre/Posttest: Students were most comfortable responsible to responding to multiple choice questions than short constructed response or open ended questions. Their scores improved by 10+ points from pre to the post tests for 82 % of the students. The remaining students' scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution Math:</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td><td>59</td><td>18</td></tr> <tr> <td>4</td><td>56</td><td>14</td></tr> <tr> <td>5</td><td>45</td><td>15</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>100% of the staff has received opportunities to participate in professional development for the 2014-2015 school-years. Professional Development included Danielson Evaluation Tool, Differentiated instruction, Student Engagement Smart Board Training, Uniform Grading Policy, Google Docs, On Course Lesson Planning and the new curriculum of My Math and Reading Wonders/Read 180/System 44.</p>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	59	18	4	56	14	5	45	15
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)												
3	59	18												
4	56	14												
5	45	15												
Leadership	Surveys Evaluations Feedback	<p><b>Through the 10 School Leadership Council Meetings, 10 Parent Teacher Association Meetings, &amp; 20 Parent Workshops administration was able to :</b></p> <p>Create a mutually shard vision and mission to increase student achievement</p>												

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)									
		<p>and parental involvement.</p> <p>The leader will also engage best practices regarding self-reflection and self-assessment.</p> <p>Develop a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.</p> <p>Ensure effective management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment</p> <p>Collaborate with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources</p>									
School Climate and Culture	School Safety Team School Leadership Council	Reduce the number of student suspensions and discipline infractions by at least 10%.									
School-Based Youth Services	Guidance Counseling HSSC Counseling Honor Roll Extra Curricular Activities (sports, mentoring, and clubs) Breakfast In the Classroom Wrap Around Program Bullying Workshops After School Tutorial Programs Assemblies	<p>100% student participation in all school activities.</p> <p><b>After School Tutoring ELA:</b>            Pre/Posttest: Students were most comfortable responsible to responding to multiple choice questions than short constructed response or open ended questions. Their scores improved by 10+ points from pre to the post tests for 82 % of the students. The remaining students' scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution ELA:</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td><td>54</td><td>24</td></tr> <tr> <td>4</td><td>63</td><td>15</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	54	24	4	63	15
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)									
3	54	24									
4	63	15									

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)														
		5	51	11												
		<p><b>After School Tutoring Math:</b></p> <p>Pre/Posttest: Students were most comfortable responsible to responding to multiple choice questions than short constructed response or open ended questions. Their scores improved by 10+ points from pre to the post tests for 82 % of the students. The remaining students’ scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution Math:</b></p> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>59</td><td>18</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>56</td><td>14</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>45</td><td>15</td></tr></table>			Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	59	18	4	56	14	5	45	15
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)														
3	59	18														
4	56	14														
5	45	15														
Students with Disabilities	Resource Room Inclusion Model	<p>100% student participation in all school activities. Provided the least restrictive environment for all student with disabilities, based on IEP needs.</p> <p><b>After School Tutoring ELA:</b></p> <p>Pre/Posttest: Students were most comfortable responsible to responding to multiple choice questions than short constructed response or open ended questions. Their scores improved by 10+ points from pre to the post tests for 82 % of the students. The remaining students’ scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p>														

# SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)																								
		<p><b>Grade Distribution ELA:</b></p> <table> <tr> <th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr> <tr> <td>3</td><td>54</td><td>24</td></tr> <tr> <td>4</td><td>63</td><td>15</td></tr> <tr> <td>5</td><td>51</td><td>11</td></tr> </table> <p><b>After School Tutoring Math:</b></p> <p>Pre/Posttest: Students were most comfortable responsible to responding to multiple choice questions than short constructed response or open ended questions. Their scores improved by 10+ points from pre to the post tests for 82 % of the students. The remaining students' scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution Math:</b></p> <table> <tr> <th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr> <tr> <td>3</td><td>59</td><td>18</td></tr> <tr> <td>4</td><td>56</td><td>14</td></tr> <tr> <td>5</td><td>45</td><td>15</td></tr> </table>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	54	24	4	63	15	5	51	11	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	59	18	4	56	14	5	45	15
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)																								
3	54	24																								
4	63	15																								
5	51	11																								
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)																								
3	59	18																								
4	56	14																								
5	45	15																								
Homeless Students		<p>100% student participation in all school activities.</p> <p><b>After School Tutoring ELA:</b></p>																								

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)																		
		<p>Pre/Posttest: Students were most comfortable responsible to responding to multiple choice questions than short constructed response or open ended questions. Their scores improved by 10+ points from pre to the post tests for 82 % of the students. The remaining students' scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution ELA:</b></p> <table> <tr> <th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr> <tr> <td>3</td><td>54</td><td>24</td></tr> <tr> <td>4</td><td>63</td><td>15</td></tr> <tr> <td>5</td><td>51</td><td>11</td></tr> </table> <p><b>After School Tutoring Math:</b></p> <p>Pre/Posttest: Students were most comfortable responsible to responding to multiple choice questions than short constructed response or open ended questions. Their scores improved by 10+ points from pre to the post tests for 82 % of the students. The remaining students' scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution Math:</b></p> <table> <tr> <th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr> <tr> <td>3</td><td>59</td><td>18</td></tr> </table>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	54	24	4	63	15	5	51	11	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	59	18
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)																		
3	54	24																		
4	63	15																		
5	51	11																		
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)																		
3	59	18																		



# SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)															
		4	56	14													
		5	45	15													
Migrant Students		100% student participation in all school activities. <b>After School Tutoring ELA:</b> Pre/Posttest: Students were most comfortable responsible to responding to multiple choice questions than short constructed response or open ended questions. Their scores improved by 10+ points from pre to the post tests for 82 % of the students. The remaining students’ scores were impacted by poor attendance.  <b>Grade Distribution ELA:</b> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>54</td><td>24</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>63</td><td>15</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>51</td><td>11</td></tr></table> <b>After School Tutoring Math:</b> Pre/Posttest: Students were most comfortable responsible to responding to multiple choice questions than short constructed response or open ended questions. Their scores improved by 10+ points from pre to the post tests for 82 % of the students. The remaining students’ scores were impacted by poor attendance.				Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	54	24	4	63	15	5	51	11
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)															
3	54	24															
4	63	15															
5	51	11															

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)												
		<b>Grade Distribution Math:</b> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td><td>59</td><td>18</td></tr> <tr> <td>4</td><td>56</td><td>14</td></tr> <tr> <td>5</td><td>45</td><td>15</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	59	18	4	56	14	5	45	15
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)												
3	59	18												
4	56	14												
5	45	15												
English Language Learners	Push-In Program	<p>100% student participation in all school activities.</p> <p><b>After School Tutoring ELA:</b></p> <p>Pre/Posttest: Students were most comfortable responsible to responding to multiple choice questions than short constructed response or open ended questions. Their scores improved by 10+ points from pre to the post tests for 82 % of the students. The remaining students' scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution ELA:</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td><td>54</td><td>24</td></tr> <tr> <td>4</td><td>63</td><td>15</td></tr> <tr> <td>5</td><td>51</td><td>11</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	54	24	4	63	15	5	51	11
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)												
3	54	24												
4	63	15												
5	51	11												

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)												
		<p><b>After School Tutoring Math:</b></p> <p>Pre/Posttest: Students were most comfortable responsible to responding to multiple choice questions than short constructed response or open ended questions. Their scores improved by 10+ points from pre to the post tests for 82 % of the students. The remaining students' scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution Math:</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td><td>59</td><td>18</td></tr> <tr> <td>4</td><td>56</td><td>14</td></tr> <tr> <td>5</td><td>45</td><td>15</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	59	18	4	56	14	5	45	15
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)												
3	59	18												
4	56	14												
5	45	15												
Economically Disadvantaged		<p>100% student participation in all school activities.</p> <p><b>After School Tutoring ELA:</b></p> <p>Pre/Posttest: Students were most comfortable responsible to responding to multiple choice questions than short constructed response or open ended questions. Their scores improved by 10+ points from pre to the post tests for 82 % of the students. The remaining students' scores were impacted by poor attendance.</p> <p><b>Grade Distribution ELA:</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)									
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)												

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)												
		3	54	24										
		4	63	15										
		5	51	11										
		<b>After School Tutoring Math:</b>												
		Pre/Posttest: Students were most comfortable responsible to responding to multiple choice questions than short constructed response or open ended questions. Their scores improved by 10+ points from pre to the post tests for 82 % of the students. The remaining students’ scores were impacted by poor attendance.												
		<b>Grade Distribution Math:</b>												
		<table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>At Benchmark (A, B, C)</th><th>Below Benchmark (D, F)</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>59</td><td>18</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>56</td><td>14</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>45</td><td>15</td></tr></table>			Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)	3	59	18	4	56	14	5
Grade	At Benchmark (A, B, C)	Below Benchmark (D, F)												
3	59	18												
4	56	14												
5	45	15												

### 2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process\* *Narrative*

1. What process did the school use to conduct its needs assessment?

## **SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)***

Mount Vernon's Parent Coordinator conducted a series of Parent Hours/Workshops. At the end of each event, parents were given an evaluation sheet and their ideas and concerns were extrapolated from those sheets in addition to discussions. This data is kept on file. The School Leadership Council (SLC) and the Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) also conducted workshops and provided opportunities for parents to provide feedback.

### **2. What process did the school use to collect and compile data for student subgroups?**

The school was able to collect and compile data from PARCC, ACCESS, district benchmark assessments, and READ 180 SRI administrations. The data was used to develop the needs assessment for student sub-groups. Community meetings, PTA, SLC, lunch applications, walkthroughs, and dialogue with stakeholders were also utilized to provide feedback.

### **3. How does the school ensure that the data used in the needs assessment process are valid (measures what it is designed to measure) and reliable (yields consistent results)? <sup>1</sup>**

The school is able to ensure that the data used in the needs assessment process are valid and reliable by aligning them with the state common core standards in English Language Arts and Mathematics. The data provided by Irvington Public Schools is disaggregated for further analysis and statistically reliable and valid. PARCC is utilized by the state of NJ, which will be PARCC for the 2015 test administration.

### **4. What did the data analysis reveal regarding classroom instruction?**

Data analysis indicated that the classroom instruction is in need of an increase of rigor and relevant Professional Development in the areas of student engagement and feedback. There is also a need to increase resources and implement best practice application in the areas of English Language Arts (reading, writing, and comprehension) and Mathematics (geometry & measurement, patterns & algebra, data analysis, and problem solving).

---

<sup>1</sup> Definitions taken from Understanding Research Methods" by Mildred Patten  
Patten, M. L. (2012). Understanding Research Methods. Glendale, California: Pyrczak Publishing

## **SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)***

### **5. What did the data analysis reveal regarding professional development implemented in the previous year(s)?**

Professional development must be ongoing and job-embedded. Teachers require immediate feedback that is constructive and actionable. This will be provided through walkthroughs and directed rounds.

### **6. How does the school identify educationally at-risk students in a timely manner?**

The data team and faculty members identify the at-risk students through the use of assessments, benchmarks, and data analysis. The analysis of data from a variety of sources will be conducted throughout the 2014-2015 SY: discipline referrals, suspensions, I & R S referrals, teacher recommendation, HSSC & Guidance referrals, & student attendance.

### **7. How does the school provide effective interventions to educationally at-risk students?**

The school provides effective interventions to educationally at risk students by providing with an extended day tutorial program, as well as full implementation of Read 180/System 44, I & R S referrals, extracurricular activities, and referrals to Guidance & HSSC.

### **8. How does the school address the needs of migrant students?**

According to NJ SMART, there are no known migrant students at Mount Vernon.

### **9. How does the school address the needs of homeless students?**

According to NJ SMART, there are no known homeless students at Mount Vernon.

### **10. How does the school engage its teachers in decisions regarding the use of academic assessments to provide information on and improve the instructional program?**

The school engages its teachers in decisions regarding the use of academic assessment through the following: General/Departmental meetings, common planning, and Professional Development Workshops. During these specified faculty members are provided with assessments to improve academic achievement for all students.

### **11. How does the school help students transition from preschool to kindergarten, elementary to middle school and/or middle to high school?**

## **SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)**

The school helps students transition from Preschool to Kindergarten, Elementary to Middle School by providing an orientation program. For example, The Office of Early Childhood met with the Kindergarten teachers as well as Administration for a meeting that outlines the scope and sequence of the curriculum. The 5<sup>th</sup> grade students will attend middle school orientation and be provided transportation tot heir respective middle schools for it. In order to transition our fifth grade students to Middle School, the guidance counselors communicate with the administration to ensure a smooth transition. The principal ensures that the curriculum is implemented to foster a continuation of learning objectives.

### **12. How did the school select the priority problems and root causes for the 2014-2015 schoolwide plan?**

Priority problems are identified based on district academic and community goals as well as state assessments. Analysis of PARCC scores at faculty meetings and grade level meetings provided opportunities to select the priority problems and root causes for our school wide plan.

*\*Provide a separate response for each question.*

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

### 2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process *Description of Priority Problems and Interventions to Address Them*

Based upon the school's needs assessment, select at least three (3) priority problems that will be addressed in this plan. Complete the information below for each priority problem.

	#1	#2
Name of priority problem	Low achievement in English Language Arts	Low achievement in Mathematics
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	Students are performing below grade level due to a lack of early literacy skills, poor fluency and poor comprehension: PARCC Scores/Cycle Assessments/Student Report Cards	Students are performing below grade level due to poor mathematics and problem solving skills. PARCC/Cycle Assessments/Student Report Cards
Describe the root causes of the problem	Possible root causes of low achievement in ELA include lack of rigor in the classroom, limited differentiation of instruction, the lack of high quality, thought provoking questions and a lack of engagement in the classroom.	Possible root causes of low achievement in mathematics include lack of rigor in the classroom, limited differentiation of instruction, the lack of high quality, thought provoking questions and a lack of engagement in the classroom.
Subgroups or populations addressed	All students in grades Kindergarten through Fifth Grade Students with Disabilities ELLs	All students in grades Kindergarten through Fifth Grade Students with Disabilities ELLs
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	Science Social Studies Mathematics	Science Social Studies ELA
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	Reading Wonders Read 180/System 44 Fountas and Pinnell Differentiated Instruction Common Core State Standards Curriculum and Pacing Guides Cycle Assessments Portfolios Article: "Put Reading First"	My Math/Houghton Mifflin Common Core State Standards Differentiated Instruction Curriculum and Pacing Guides Common Planning Benchmark/Unit Assessments Collaborative Teaching Practices



**SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)***

	Common Planning Collaborative Teaching Practices	
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	There is alignment with the Common Core State Standards and Harcourt Trophies, however during common planning periods; teachers match the curriculum to the standards.	The math program My Math is aligned to the National Common Core State Standards.

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

### 2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process *Description of Priority Problems and Interventions to Address Them (continued)*

	#3	#4
Name of priority problem	School Culture & Climate	
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	Participation in PTA meetings is less than 1% Parent-Teacher Conference average attendance is 62% School events and activities is below 50%	
Describe the root causes of the problem	Work schedules SES More engaging activities & workshops	
Subgroups or populations addressed	All students in the Kindergarten through Fifth grade. Students with disabilities ELLs	
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	Community Involvement	
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	Department of Education offers resources on the National Common Core State Standards.  <a href="http://www2.ed.gov/parents/academic/help/hyc.html">http://www2.ed.gov/parents/academic/help/hyc.html</a> (Helping your child series)  <a href="http://www.state.nj.us/education/parents/articles/tips/">http://www.state.nj.us/education/parents/articles/tips/</a> (Tips for helping child)	
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	When the school and home connection is made, it can be a valuable asset to the school. Parents can be involved in their child(ren)'s education by participation in workshops to know what and how learning is taking place in the school. Their knowledge and participation can impact student learning, therefore impacting	

<b>SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT <i>ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)</i></b>
---

	achievement.	
--	--------------	--

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies ESEA §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

*ESEA §1114(b) Components of a Schoolwide Program: A schoolwide program shall include . . . schoolwide reform strategies that . . . “*

### 2015-2016 Interventions to Address Student Achievement

<i>ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school:</i>					
Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities				
Math	Students with Disabilities				
ELA	Homeless				
Math	Homeless				
ELA	Migrant				
Math	Migrant				
ELA	ELLs				
Math	ELLs				
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged				
Math	Economically Disadvantaged				
ELA					
Math					

*\*Use an asterisk to denote new programs.*

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies ESEA §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

### 2015-2016 Extended Learning Time and Extended Day/Year Interventions to Address Student Achievement

***ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an extended school year and before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;***

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities				
Math	Students with Disabilities				
ELA	Homeless				
Math	Homeless				
ELA	Migrant				
Math	Migrant				
ELA	ELLs				
Math	ELLs				
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged				
Math	Economically Disadvantaged				
ELA					
Math					

***\*Use an asterisk to denote new programs.***

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies ESEA §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

### 2015-2016 Professional Development to Address Student Achievement and Priority Problems

***ESEA §1114 (b) (1) (D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a) (4), high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.***

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Balanced Literacy Read 180 System 44 Reading Wonders After School Tutorial Programs Formative Assessments Professional Development Least Restrictive Environment	Administration Teachers	Increase student achievement (Reading, Writing, Phonemic Awareness, Vocabulary, Phonics, Fluency, and Comprehension) by 5%.  Data regarding student performance will be collected from Formative Assessments, Summative Assessment, Unit Tests, Benchmark and Cycle tests, District and State assessments.	What Works Clearinghouse  The National Institute for Literacy Facilitated a study regarding Literacy in the United States: It describes the findings of the National Reading Panel Report and provides analysis and discussion in five areas of reading instruction: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and text comprehension. (September 2010)
Math	Students with Disabilities	My Math My Math E-assessments After School Tutorial Programs Formative Assessments Professional Development	Administration Teachers	Increase student achievement (Item Analysis, Number & Numerical Operations, Geometry& Measurement, Patterns& Algebra, Discrete Mathematics and Problem Solving) by 5%.  Data regarding student performance will be collected from Formative Assessments, Summative Assessment, Unit Tests, Benchmark and Cycle tests,	What Works Clearinghouse:  Early Reading and Mathematics Moving Evidence of What Works Into Practice (Media) 2009  The National Mathematics Advisory Panel made the following statement. "Explicit systematic instruction typically entails teachers explaining and demonstrating specific strategies and allowing students many

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies ESEA §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

***ESEA §1114 (b) (1) (D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a) (4), high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.***

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
				District and State assessments.	opportunities to ask and answer questions and to think about the
ELA	Homeless	Balanced Literacy Read 180 System 44 Reading Wonders After School Tutorial Programs Formative Assessments Professional Development Least Restrictive Environment	Administration Teachers	Increase student achievement (Reading, Writing, Phonemic Awareness, Vocabulary, Phonics, Fluency, and Comprehension) by 5%.  Data regarding student performance will be collected from Formative Assessments, Summative Assessment, Unit Tests, Benchmark and Cycle tests, District and State assessments.	What Works Clearinghouse  The National Institute for Literacy Facilitated a study regarding Literacy in the United States: It describes the findings of the National Reading Panel Report and provides analysis and discussion in five areas of reading instruction: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and text comprehension. (September 2010)
Math	Homeless	My Math My Math E-assessments After School Tutorial Programs Formative Assessments Professional Development	Administration Teachers	Increase student achievement (Item Analysis, Number & Numerical Operations, Geometry& Measurement, Patterns& Algebra, Discrete Mathematics and Problem Solving) by 5%.  Data regarding student performance will be collected from Formative Assessments, Summative Assessment, Unit Tests, Benchmark and Cycle tests, District and State assessments.	What Works Clearinghouse:  Early Reading and Mathematics Moving Evidence of What Works Into Practice (Media) 2009  The National Mathematics Advisory Panel made the following statement. "Explicit systematic instruction typically entails teachers explaining and demonstrating specific strategies and allowing students many opportunities to ask and answer

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies ESEA §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

***ESEA §1114 (b) (1) (D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a) (4), high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.***

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
					questions and to think about the
ELA	Migrant	Balanced Literacy Read 180 System 44 Reading Wonders After School Tutorial Programs Formative Assessments Professional Development Least Restrictive Environment	Administration Teachers	Increase student achievement (Reading, Writing, Phonemic Awareness, Vocabulary, Phonics, Fluency, and Comprehension) by 5%.  Data regarding student performance will be collected from Formative Assessments, Summative Assessment, Unit Tests, Benchmark and Cycle tests, District and State assessments.	What Works Clearinghouse  The National Institute for Literacy Facilitated a study regarding Literacy in the United States: It describes the findings of the National Reading Panel Report and provides analysis and discussion in five areas of reading instruction: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and text comprehension. (September 2010)
Math	Migrant	My Math My Math E-assessments After School Tutorial Programs Formative Assessments Professional Development	Administration Teachers	Increase student achievement (Item Analysis, Number & Numerical Operations, Geometry& Measurement, Patterns& Algebra, Discrete Mathematics and Problem Solving) by 5%.  Data regarding student performance will be collected from Formative Assessments, Summative Assessment, Unit Tests, Benchmark and Cycle tests, District and State assessments.	What Works Clearinghouse:  Early Reading and Mathematics Moving Evidence of What Works Into Practice (Media) 2009  The National Mathematics Advisory Panel made the following statement. "Explicit systematic instruction typically entails teachers explaining and demonstrating specific strategies and allowing students many opportunities to ask and answer questions and to think about the



## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies ESEA §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

***ESEA §1114 (b) (1) (D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a) (4), high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.***

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	ELLs	Balanced Literacy Read 180 System 44 Reading Wonders After School Tutorial Programs Formative Assessments Professional Development Least Restrictive Environment	Administration Teachers	Increase student achievement (Reading, Writing, Phonemic Awareness, Vocabulary, Phonics, Fluency, and Comprehension) by 5%.  Data regarding student performance will be collected from Formative Assessments, Summative Assessment, Unit Tests, Benchmark and Cycle tests, District and State assessments.	What Works Clearinghouse  The National Institute for Literacy Facilitated a study regarding Literacy in the United States: It describes the findings of the National Reading Panel Report and provides analysis and discussion in five areas of reading instruction: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and text comprehension. (September 2010)
Math	ELLs	My Math My Math E-assessments After School Tutorial Programs Formative Assessments Professional Development	Administration Teachers	Increase student achievement (Item Analysis, Number & Numerical Operations, Geometry& Measurement, Patterns& Algebra, Discrete Mathematics and Problem Solving) by 5%.  Data regarding student performance will be collected from Formative Assessments, Summative Assessment, Unit Tests, Benchmark and Cycle tests, District and State assessments.	What Works Clearinghouse:  Early Reading and Mathematics Moving Evidence of What Works Into Practice (Media) 2009  The National Mathematics Advisory Panel made the following statement. "Explicit systematic instruction typically entails teachers explaining and demonstrating specific strategies and allowing students many opportunities to ask and answer questions and to think about the
ELA	Economically	Balanced Literacy	Administration	Increase student achievement	What Works Clearinghouse

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies ESEA §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

***ESEA §1114 (b) (1) (D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a) (4), high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.***

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
	Disadvantaged	Read 180 System 44 Reading Wonders After School Tutorial Programs Formative Assessments Professional Development Least Restrictive Environment	Teachers	(Reading, Writing, Phonemic Awareness, Vocabulary, Phonics, Fluency, and Comprehension) by 5%.  Data regarding student performance will be collected from Formative Assessments, Summative Assessment, Unit Tests, Benchmark and Cycle tests, District and State assessments.	The National Institute for Literacy Facilitated a study regarding Literacy in the United States: It describes the findings of the National Reading Panel Report and provides analysis and discussion in five areas of reading instruction: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and text comprehension. (September 2010)
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	My Math My Math E-assessments After School Tutorial Programs Formative Assessments Professional Development	Administration Teachers	Increase student achievement (Item Analysis, Number & Numerical Operations, Geometry& Measurement, Patterns& Algebra, Discrete Mathematics and Problem Solving) by 5%.  Data regarding student performance will be collected from Formative Assessments, Summative Assessment, Unit Tests, Benchmark and Cycle tests, District and State assessments.	What Works Clearinghouse:  Early Reading and Mathematics Moving Evidence of What Works Into Practice (Media) 2009  The National Mathematics Advisory Panel made the following statement. "Explicit systematic instruction typically entails teachers explaining and demonstrating specific strategies and allowing students many opportunities to ask and answer questions and to think about the

***\*Use an asterisk to denote new programs.***

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies ESEA §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

*24 CFR § 200.26(c): Core Elements of a Schoolwide Program (Evaluation). A school operating a schoolwide program must—(1) Annually evaluate the implementation of, and results achieved by, the schoolwide program, using data from the State's annual assessments and other indicators of academic achievement; (2) Determine whether the schoolwide program has been effective in increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students who had been furthest from achieving the standards; and (3) Revise the plan, as necessary, based on the results of the evaluation, to ensure continuous improvement of students in the schoolwide program.*

### Evaluation of Schoolwide Program\*

(For schools approved to operate a schoolwide program beginning in the 2015-2016 school year)

All Title I schoolwide programs must conduct an annual evaluation to determine if the strategies in the schoolwide plan are achieving the planned outcomes and contributing to student achievement. Schools must evaluate the implementation of their schoolwide program and the outcomes of their schoolwide program.

- 1. Who will be responsible for evaluating the schoolwide program for 2015-2016? Will the review be conducted internally (by school staff), or externally? How frequently will evaluation take place?**

The principal and stakeholders will be responsible for evaluating the school wide program for the 2015-2016 school year. In addition, the review will be conducted internally. SLC and the data team will assist in evaluation as well on a quarterly basis.

- 2. What barriers or challenges does the school anticipate during the implementation process?**

Teacher attendance on professional development days as well as student attendance is a concern that will be closely monitored during the implementation process.

- 3. How will the school obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders to implement the program(s)?**

The school will obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders by holding monthly meetings that will require their participation. The SLC, PTA and data team are all representative of the stakeholders of the school.

- 4. What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the staff?**

The school will use surveys as a measurement tool that is simple yet depicts the perception of the staff.

- 5. What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the community?**

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies ESEA §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

The school will use surveys as a measurement tool that is simple yet depicts the perception of the parents and community. Sign-in sheets at various parent and community meetings will be utilized to determine participation rates.

**6. How will the school structure interventions?**

The school will structure interventions by use of the I & R S, conferences with parents and families, collaboration with teachers and staff to identify student needs, professional development, collaboration with Central Office, collaboration with Guidance & HSSC, presentations at PTA, SLC & community meetings, and professional development.

**7. How frequently will students receive instructional interventions?**

The students receive instructional interventions on an as needed basis, as indicated in their IEPs and through the I & R S process.

**8. What resources/technologies will the school use to support the schoolwide program?**

The school uses interactive Smartboards, computers, laptops, chrome books, as well as hands-on activities to support the schoolwide program.

**9. What quantitative data will the school use to measure the effectiveness of each intervention provided?**

The school will use PARCC scores, district benchmark assessments results, READ 180 data, results from My Math online assessments, and data from PowerSchool and NJ SMART to measure the effectiveness of the interventions.

**10. How will the school disseminate the results of the schoolwide program evaluation to its stakeholder groups?**

The school will disseminate the results via grade level and vertical articulation meetings, PTA, SLC, community meetings, events, faculty meetings, parent workshops, and email.

*\*Provide a separate response for each question.*

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)*

### *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F) Strategies to increase parental involvement in accordance with §1118, such as family literacy services*

Research continues to show that successful schools have significant and sustained levels of family and community engagement. As a result, schoolwide plans must contain strategies to involve families and the community, especially in helping children do well in school. In addition, families and the community must be involved in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the schoolwide program.

#### **2015-2016 Family and Community Engagement Strategies to Address Student Achievement and Priority Problems**

<b>Content Area Focus</b>	<b>Target Population(s)</b>	<b>Name of Strategy</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)</b>	<b>Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)</b>
ELA	Parent Coordinator Administration Staff PTA President	Parent Coordinator Administration Staff PTA President	Parent Coordinator Administration Staff PTA President	<p>A 10% increased parental and community involvement at school events as evidenced by sign-in sheets.</p> <p>A 5% increase in student proficiency level on state, district and teacher created assessment.</p> <p>At least an average 95% student attendance as evidenced by Power School, attendance data, and monthly Principal's report.</p> <p>50% decrease in student suspension. Data will be obtained from Positive Behavior Support in Schools as well as Power School.</p>	<p>Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making</p> <p>Families, Schools, and Communities: Building Partnerships for Educating Children. By Chandler Barbour, Nita H. Barbour &amp; Patricia A. Scully</p>
Math	Parent Coordinator Administration Staff	Parent Coordinator Administration Staff PTA President	Parent Coordinator Administration Staff	<p>A 10% increased parental and community involvement at school events as evidenced by sign-in sheets.</p> <p>A 5% increase in student</p>	<p>Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making</p> <p>Families, Schools, and Communities:</p>

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)*

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
	PTA President		PTA President	<p>proficiency level on state, district and teacher created assessment.</p> <p>At least an average 95% student attendance as evidenced by Power School, attendance data, and monthly Principal's report.</p> <p>50% decrease in student suspension. Data will be obtained from Positive Behavior Support in Schools as well as Power School.</p>	<p>Building Partnerships for Educating Children.</p> <p>By Chandler Barbour, Nita H. Barbour &amp; Patricia A. Scully</p>
ELA	Parent Coordinator Administration Staff PTA President	Parent Coordinator Administration Staff PTA President	Parent Coordinator Administration Staff PTA President	<p>A 10% increased parental and community involvement at school events as evidenced by sign-in sheets.</p> <p>A 5% increase in student proficiency level on state, district and teacher created assessment.</p> <p>At least an average 95% student attendance as evidenced by Power School, attendance data, and monthly Principal's report.</p> <p>50% decrease in student suspension. Data will be obtained from Positive</p>	<p>Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making</p> <p>Families, Schools, and Communities: Building Partnerships for Educating Children.</p> <p>By Chandler Barbour, Nita H. Barbour &amp; Patricia A. Scully</p>

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)*

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
				Behavior Support in Schools as well as Power School.	
Math	Parent Coordinator Administration Staff PTA President	Parent Coordinator Administration Staff PTA President	Parent Coordinator Administration Staff PTA President	<p>A 10% increased parental and community involvement at school events as evidenced by sign-in sheets.</p> <p>A 5% increase in student proficiency level on state, district and teacher created assessment.</p> <p>At least an average 95% student attendance as evidenced by Power School, attendance data, and monthly Principal's report.</p> <p>50% decrease in student suspension. Data will be obtained from Positive Behavior Support in Schools as well as Power School.</p>	<p>Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making</p> <p>Families, Schools, and Communities: Building Partnerships for Educating Children.</p> <p>By Chandler Barbour, Nita H. Barbour &amp; Patricia A. Scully</p>
ELA	Parent Coordinator Administration Staff PTA President	Parent Coordinator Administration Staff PTA President	Parent Coordinator Administration Staff PTA President	<p>A 10% increased parental and community involvement at school events as evidenced by sign-in sheets.</p> <p>A 5% increase in student proficiency level on state, district and teacher created</p>	<p>Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making</p> <p>Families, Schools, and Communities: Building Partnerships for Educating Children.</p>

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)*

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
				<p>assessment.</p> <p>At least an average 95% student attendance as evidenced by Power School, attendance data, and monthly Principal's report.</p> <p>50% decrease in student suspension. Data will be obtained from Positive Behavior Support in Schools as well as Power School.</p>	By Chandler Barbour, Nita H. Barbour & Patricia A. Scully
Math	Parent Coordinator Administration Staff PTA President	Parent Coordinator Administration Staff PTA President	Parent Coordinator Administration Staff PTA President	<p>A 10% increased parental and community involvement at school events as evidenced by sign-in sheets.</p> <p>A 5% increase in student proficiency level on state, district and teacher created assessment.</p> <p>At least an average 95% student attendance as evidenced by Power School, attendance data, and monthly Principal's report.</p> <p>50% decrease in student suspension. Data will be obtained from Positive Behavior Support in Schools as well as Power School.</p>	<p>Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making</p> <p>Families, Schools, and Communities: Building Partnerships for Educating Children.</p> <p>By Chandler Barbour, Nita H. Barbour &amp; Patricia A. Scully</p>



## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)*

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Parent Coordinator Administration Staff PTA President	Parent Coordinator Administration Staff PTA President	Parent Coordinator Administration Staff PTA President	<p>A 10% increased parental and community involvement at school events as evidenced by sign-in sheets.</p> <p>A 5% increase in student proficiency level on state, district and teacher created assessment.</p> <p>At least an average 95% student attendance as evidenced by Power School, attendance data, and monthly Principal's report.</p> <p>50% decrease in student suspension. Data will be obtained from Positive Behavior Support in Schools as well as Power School.</p>	<p>Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making</p> <p>Families, Schools, and Communities: Building Partnerships for Educating Children.</p> <p>By Chandler Barbour, Nita H. Barbour &amp; Patricia A. Scully</p>
Math	Parent Coordinator Administration Staff PTA President	Parent Coordinator Administration Staff PTA President	Parent Coordinator Administration Staff PTA President	<p>A 10% increased parental and community involvement at school events as evidenced by sign-in sheets.</p> <p>A 5% increase in student proficiency level on state, district and teacher created assessment.</p> <p>At least an average 95%</p>	<p>Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making</p> <p>Families, Schools, and Communities: Building Partnerships for Educating Children.</p> <p>By Chandler Barbour, Nita H. Barbour &amp; Patricia A. Scully</p>

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)*

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
				<p>student attendance as evidenced by Power School, attendance data, and monthly Principal's report.</p> <p>50% decrease in student suspension. Data will be obtained from Positive Behavior Support in Schools as well as Power School.</p>	
ELA	Parent Coordinator Administration Staff PTA President	Parent Coordinator Administration Staff PTA President	Parent Coordinator Administration Staff PTA President	<p>A 10% increased parental and community involvement at school events as evidenced by sign-in sheets.</p> <p>A 5% increase in student proficiency level on state, district and teacher created assessment.</p> <p>At least an average 95% student attendance as evidenced by Power School, attendance data, and monthly Principal's report.</p> <p>50% decrease in student suspension. Data will be obtained from Positive Behavior Support in Schools as well as Power School.</p>	<p>Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making</p> <p>Families, Schools, and Communities: Building Partnerships for Educating Children.</p> <p>By Chandler Barbour, Nita H. Barbour &amp; Patricia A. Scully</p>

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)*

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
Math	Parent Coordinator Administration Staff PTA President	Parent Coordinator Administration Staff PTA President	Parent Coordinator Administration Staff PTA President	<p>A 10% increased parental and community involvement at school events as evidenced by sign-in sheets.</p> <p>A 5% increase in student proficiency level on state, district and teacher created assessment.</p> <p>At least an average 95% student attendance as evidenced by Power School, attendance data, and monthly Principal's report.</p> <p>50% decrease in student suspension. Data will be obtained from Positive Behavior Support in Schools as well as Power School.</p>	<p>Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making</p> <p>Families, Schools, and Communities: Building Partnerships for Educating Children.</p> <p>By Chandler Barbour, Nita H. Barbour &amp; Patricia A. Scully</p>

*\*Use an asterisk to denote new programs.*

## **SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)***

### **2015-2016 Family and Community Engagement Narrative**

- 1. How will the school's family and community engagement program help to address the priority problems identified in the comprehensive needs assessment?**

The priority problems will be addressed via monthly PTA meetings, monthly parent workshops, twice yearly family nights, and increased parental involvement on school standing committees.

- 2. How will the school engage parents in the development of the written parent involvement policy?**

The SLC and PTA will have input in the development of the written parent involvement policy. They will be able to voice their questions concerning in the policy. The Parent Coordinator will also be able to voice her opinion in the creation of the policy. The Parent Coordinator knows the myriad of concerns voiced by the parents and will be able to make sure the parental needs are addressed in the policy.

- 3. How will the school distribute its written parent involvement policy?**

The distribution of the written parent policy will be mailed home to the parents, as well as given to students a copy to bring home. It will also be displayed on the District and school websites.

- 4. How will the school engage parents in the development of the school-parent compact?**

Parents will be engaged in the development of the school-parent compact by dialoging with the Parent Coordinator concerning the necessary components of an effective school-parent document. The compact will be relevant so that the elements that relate to current achievement data, as well as current behavioral and attendance trends. PTA & SLC representation will be requested in order to ensure additional parent voices are heard.

- 5. How will the school ensure that parents receive and review the school-parent compact?**

The compact will be sent home and parents will be asked to review, provide feedback if necessary, and return. This will be done through the use of technology utilizing such features as the parent handbook, PTA meetings, school newsletter, and it will be

## **SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)***

distributed at Open House, grade level community meetings, flyers, parent teacher conferences, and telephone blasts. Also, parents are invited to see their child's teacher in order to read and sign the compact.

### **6. How will the school report its student achievement data to families and the community?**

All information relating to district reports can be obtained through the Irvington Public School district website. Information is also published in the Irvington Herald and The Star Ledger. In addition, newsletters and reports are sent home to parents/guardians on a regular basis. Information can also be discussed during Parent/Teacher conferences Open Houses, PTA and SLC meetings.

### **7. How will the school notify families and the community if the district has not met its annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAO) for Title III?**

Letters from Central Office Administration, data boards, and information disseminated at PTA & SLC meetings and Back to School Night. This will be done through the use of technology utilizing such features as the school newsletter, and it will be distributed at Open House. In addition, there are monthly parent meetings, district community outreach meetings, email, and letters to parents, district website, monthly SLC meetings, and the school's open door policy.

### **8. How will the school inform families and the community of the school's disaggregated assessment results?**

Letters from Central Office Administration, data boards, and information disseminated at PTA & SLC meetings and Back to School Night. This will be done through the use of technology utilizing such features as the school newsletter, and it will be distributed at Open House. In addition, there are monthly parent meetings, district community outreach meetings, email, and letters to parents, district website, monthly SLC meetings, and the school's open door policy.

### **9. How will the school involve families and the community in the development of the Title I Schoolwide Plan?**

The School-wide Plan must be relevant with all the elements that relates to current academic achievement. Mt. Vernon Ave. School will involve families and the community in developing this plan by enlisting the expertise of the Parent Coordinator and asking about the necessary components of an effective plan. PTA, SLC and community meetings are also opportunities to involve the families in the development of the school wide plan.

### **10. How will the school inform families about the academic achievement of their child/children?**

## **SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)***

Progress Reports and Report Cards are sent home on a quarterly basis. Test results, through the Individual Student Reports (ISRs) from Measurement Inc. are also sent home. All teachers have individual preferences on how to maintain contact with the parents/guardians. Communication through email, phone calls, and personal notes home are expected. Teachers must keep in contact with parents informing them of their student's academic achievement. Recognition assemblies will also be an opportunity to inform families of achievement.

### **11. On what specific strategies will the school use its 2015-2016 parent involvement funds?**

The 2015-2016 parent involvement funds will be used on introducing parent workshops, educational support materials, parent incentives and a parent breakfast. The purpose of these types of programs is to educate the parents about standardized assessments and becoming an integral part of their child's success.

*\*Provide a separate response for each question.*

## SCHOOLWIDE: HIGHLY QUALIFIED STAFF *ESEA §(b)(1)(E)*

### *ESEA §1114(b)(1)(E) Strategies to attract high-quality highly qualified teachers to high-need schools.*

High poverty, low-performing schools are often staffed with disproportionately high numbers of teachers who are not highly qualified. To address this disproportionality, the *ESEA* requires that all teachers of core academic subjects and instructional paraprofessionals in a schoolwide program meet the qualifications required by §1119. Student achievement increases in schools where teaching and learning have the highest priority, and students achieve at higher levels when taught by teachers who know their subject matter and are skilled in teaching it.

#### Strategies to Attract and Retain Highly-Qualified Staff

	Number & Percent	Description of Strategy to Retain HQ Staff
Teachers who meet the qualifications for HQT, consistent with Title II-A	43 & 100%	Instructional staff members will be provided with high quality professional development. New teachers will be paired with good mentors to assist them with becoming acclimated to their new position.
Teachers who do not meet the qualifications for HQT, consistent with Title II-A	0%	
Instructional Paraprofessionals who meet the qualifications required by <i>ESEA</i> (education, passing score on ParaPro test)	13 & 100%	Paraprofessionals are evaluated and those found to be not effective are provided professional development through the Essex County Education Commission
Paraprofessionals providing instructional assistance who do not meet the qualifications required by <i>ESEA</i> (education, passing score on ParaPro test)*	0%	

\* The district must assign these instructional paraprofessionals to non-instructional duties for 100% of their schedule, reassign them to a school in the district that does not operate a Title I schoolwide program, or terminate their employment with the district.

## SCHOOLWIDE: HIGHLY QUALIFIED STAFF *ESEA §(b)(1)(E)*

Although recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers is an on-going challenge in high poverty schools, low-performing students in these schools have a special need for excellent teachers. The schoolwide plan, therefore, must describe the strategies the school will utilize to attract and retain highly-qualified teachers.

Description of strategies to attract highly-qualified teachers to high-need schools	Individuals Responsible
Teaching positions are posted on New Jersey Hire, in local and statewide newspapers weekly. Teachers once hired are offered professional support from colleagues, district, and building administration.	Human Resources Administration